INDEX

Of

WITHESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
KUWASHIMA, Kazue (resumed)	29499
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	29500
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29507
Cross by Mr. YAMADA (cont'd) Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr (cont'd)	29507 29510
MORNING RECESS	29520
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Comyns Carr	29521
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29526
NOON RECESS	29538
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Comyns Carr	29539
Redirect by Mr. T. OKAMOTO	29562
Recross by Mr. KATO	29564
AFTERNOON RECESS	29565
(Witness excused)	29566

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	For	In
	No.	No.		Evidence
1517-A		3242	Telegram from Acting Ambassador FUJII to Foreign Minister HIROTA dated 16 November 1935	29537
1517-B		3242-A	Message from Ambassador ARIYOSHI in China to Foreign Minister HIROTA dated 22 November 1935	29542
2215	3243		Telegram sent from Nanking and received by the De- partment of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, on 20 April 1934 from Consul- General SUMA to HIROTA, the Minister for Foreign Affairs (No. 368)	29569
2020	3244		Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to the various Japanese Embassies with respect to the HIROTA- Lindley Conversation on 25 April 1934 (No. 460)	29578
2021	3245		Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to various Japanese Embassies dated 26 April 1934 re the situation arising out of the unauthorized Amau Statement of March 1934 (No. 465)	29585
2022	3246		Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to various Japanese Embassies dated 26 April 1934 (No. 466)	29587
2018	3247		The Address of Mr. HIROTA, Koki, Minister for Foreign Affairs at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet 22	29591
	2020 2021 2022	2020 3244 2021 3245 2022 3246	2020 3244 2021 3245 2022 3246	Foreign Minister HIROTA dated 16 November 1935 1517-B 3242-A Message from Ambassedor ARIYOSHI in China to Foreign Minister HIROTA dated 22 November 1935 2215 3243 Telegram sent from Nanking and received by the De- partment of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, on 20 April 1934 from Consul- General SUMA to HIROTA, the Minister for Foreign Affairs (No. 368) 2020 3244 Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to the various Japanese Embassies with respect to the HIROTA- Lindley Conversation on 25 April 1934 (No. 460) 2021 3245 Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to various Japanese Embassies dated 26 April 1934 re the situation arising out of the unauthorized Amau Statement of March 1934 (No. 465) 2022 3246 Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to various Japanese Embassies dated 26 April 1934 (No. 466) Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to various Japanese Embassies dated 26 April 1934 (No. 466) Telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA, Koki, Minister for Foreign Affairs at the 67th Session

Monday, 29 September 1947

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before.

For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

r å

8

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 2 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission. 4 the accused SHIRATORI will be absent during the whole 5 of the morning session from the courtroom conferring 6 with his counsel.

Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, I 9 should like to announce that No. 30 on our order of proof, dated 23 September 1947, defense document 2163, and No. 84 on the same order of proof, defense document 2466, have been withdrawn.

Furthermore, if the Tribunal please, in the light of the deletions from this witness! testimony, ordered by the Tribunal last Friday on the ground that Mr. ARITA should be the proper witness to testify on such matters, we have been trying to draft such a new affidavit which will cover those points to be submitted by the witness ARITA who will be later called. We are hopeful that this new affidavit will be ready in time, when Mr. ARITA is called, on the order of proof. But if, owing to mechanical difficulties, the affidavit is not ready in time, may I respectfully request the permission of the Tribunal to recall the witness ARITA for the submission of that further affidavit.

0

15

13

14

16

17

18

21 22

23

THE PRESIDENT: You are not likely to finish the presentation of your evidence today, apart from ARITA, or tomorrow, perhaps.

MR. YAMAOKA: I understand, if your Honors please, that Mr. OKAMOTO desires to conduct cross-examination on behalf of General MINAMI.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. OKAMOTO.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

Q Did the witness visit Manchuria or China in 1935?

A According to my recollection, it was in 1936 that I made this visit.

Q Did you not in 1935?

A According to my recollection, it was in 1936.

Q Who was the Japanese Ambassador to Manchuria in 1935?

A According to my recollection, it was General MINAMI that was Ambassador in 1935.

Q Was General MINAMI, as Ambassador, under the supervision of the Foreign Minister?

A Yes, as you say.

Q You were the Director of the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs at that time, were you not?

A Yes, I was.

8

11

13

10

14

16

17

15

18

19

20

22

2-1

Q Was there any instance that Ambassador MINAMI acted contrary to the instructions of the Foreign Minister?

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ I have no recollection that he ever did such a thing.

Q Was there any instance that MINAMI sent an ultimatum to the Chinese authorities contrary to the wishes of the Japanese Government?

A No, I have no such recollection.

Q The witness states in item 8 of his affidavit, page 3 of the English version, the last paragraph, as follows: "My memory is not quite unfalling about the particulars of those old occurrences but there occurred frequent skirmishes from May or June onward, between the Kwantung Army and Chinese forces, near the border between Jehol and the provinces of Hopeh and Chahar -- such remote and out-of-the-way places where no official from the Foreign Office was stationed."

Now, let me ask you, do you remember the socalled Northern Chahar Incident or Chang Pei Incident in June, 1945?

THE INTERPRETER: Correction on the date; 1935.

The witness' statement: I do not remember

the details of the Incidents themselves, but I remember

that 3 or 4 small incidents occurred.

- Q At that time was there a Japanese Consul at Kalgan?
 - A According to my recollection, there was.
 - Q Do you remember his name?
 - A No, I am sorry, I don't.
 - Q Was his name not HASHIMOTO?
 - A It is not in my recollection.
- Q The witness states in the next sentence, following the above quotation of the affidavit, as follows: "The Kwantung Army, and sometimes the North China Stationary Force, would lodge protests directly with the Chinese Government on all such occasions..."
 - A Yes.

11

15

19

1

Q Does this statement of yours also apply to the Northern Chahar Incident?

A According to my recollection, these border incidents consisted of the First North Chahar Incident, the Second North Chahar Incident; the First Chang Pei Incident and the Second Chang Pei Incident -- these 4 incidents. And in relation to these incidents the army negotiated directly with the other side.

Q According to exhibit No. 199, statement of Ching Teh-chun, this Incident was decided -- was described as follows: "After the departure of the said Jaranese," the four Japanese soldiers detained by the

Chinese side, "HASHIMOTO, the Japanese Consul at Kalgan, suddenly protested," etc. And it further follows the Japanese Consul ocmanded the punishment of responsible officials and employees from the Chinese authorities.

"He also demanded assurance against recurrence of similar nature."

Now, did the witness not receive such an information from the Consul at Kalgan?

A It is not in my recollection.

12

To:

短短

15

17

30

*

27

KUWASHIMA

15

1.

15

16

110

20

21

According to the said exhibit, No. 199, the 2 matter was referred to the headquarters of the Japanese garrison forces in Tientsin. This was after Consul HASHIMOTO announced the matter officially. Did you not receive such an information from Tientsin?

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: That was after Consul HASFIMOTO negotiated, not "announced officially" -negotiated.

It is not in my recollection.

Q Does the witness know that the Tientsin garrison force was independent from the Kwantung Army and was quite a different unit?

A Since this concerns the Army, I do not know the details of its organization. However, I have heard people say that on several occasions.

Q Do you know that this Northern Chahar Incident is the only case in 1935 of which General Ching Teh-chun, a Chinese witness, made a complaint in his exhibit 199?

A This is the first time I have ever heard of such a thing.

The witness states in item 8 of his affidavit, page 4, the fifth line from the top, as follows: "They," meaning the Kwantung Army or the North China Garrison, "enforced the fulfillment of these conditions with an ultimatum." Where and from what source did you get such information?

A According to my recollection, it was from the Legation in Peking.

Was not the information derived from English or Amer. or newspaper reports?

A According to my recollection, it was not from American or British newspaper reports, but from telegraphic reports from the Legation in Peking.

Q Do you know that although General Ching Tehchun accuses Japan of many things in his exhibit 199 he never mertioned a word about an ultimatum?

A Since I have not read the affidavit of Ching Teh-chun, I do not know.

TR. T. OKAMOTO: The witness testified in this Tribunal on the 17th, this month, as follows: "They," that is, subordinates of the witness when he was Consul General in Tientsin, "secured information from whatever sources were available, such as, newspaper: icles, conversations," and "rumors," etc.

THE PRESIDENT: You need not remind us of that. You can only remind him. We do not want to be reminded of what he said last week, or the week before.

Are your statements now in question based on the same sort of information?

8

5

10

12

13

14

16

18

19 20

21

22

A What is the meaning of your statement? May I have it repeated?

If I may quote the portion the witness stated in this Tribunal on the 17th of this month, you stated then the you received your informations from sources such as newspaper articles, conversations, and rumors, etc. Did you not -- owing to the large number of informations coming in from these various sources, you were unable to ascertain the credibility of these informations. Were not your informations on this occasion also the same as this statement you made the other day?

A When I testified relative to DOHIHARA's action, the telegram I sent relative to DOHIHARA's actions was actually sent by myself. At that time, as you state, the members of the Consulate made reports to me based on information which they had obtained in the manner described by you. However, I had no means of know! What means --

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: I have no means of knowing on what basis the telegram sent from the Legation in Peking received its information.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: Instead of continuing further cross-examination, I wish to refer to the testimony of MINAMI which contradicts the statement of this witness,

quote record 19,792 to 19,796, and I should like to say also that further evidence will be submitted later in MINAMI's individual case.

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague desires this question to be answered by the witness:

Did the reports received by the witness from Peiping reveal every time or at any time the source of the information?

THE WITNESS: On occasions, the source of the information was shown on the telegram, but also there were many telegrams on which no such -- on which the source v not shown.

MR. YAMADA: I am counsel YAMADA. On behalf of ITAGAKI, I would like to ask one question on one 15 point.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

17 BY MR. YAMADA:

10

11

12

13

16

24

Q Witness, I am going to ask you concerning item 23 of your affidavit. According to this, you say, 20 "There broke out the so-called Suiyuan Incident owing 21 to the activities of a part of the officers of the Kwantung Army in Inner Mongolia." What was the source of your information in testifying on this point?

In relation to this Incident, we at the Foreign office, and especially myself as the Director of the East Asiatic Affairs, knew nothing about this Incident

when it occurred, as it occurred in a remote part of China. It was only when we received a protest from the Chinese Nationalist Government relative to this Incident that we first became aware of such an occurrence.

- 1

4.4

17

15.

-

22

10

9

11

12

15

14

Do you know who were the officers who took
part in the activities and can you state their names?

A At the time I immediately sent a query to the Central Military authorities concerned. At that time an officer who was working with the Central Military authorities and with whom I was in continual contact told me that this was the only activity -- the activity of one or two junior officers in the Mwantung Army.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. YANAOKA.

MR. YAMAOKA: No further examination.

'E PRESIDENT: Ir. Comyns Carr.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Q Mr. KUWASHIDA, do you say that you were very closely in the confidence of Mr. HIROTA while he was Foreign Minister and Prime Minister?

A I could -- It would be -- I shall refrain from stating from my side that HIROTA placed great confidence in me. However, I can state surely that I was always in very close contact with him.

O Do you say that he always disclosed to you his real opinions and intentions?

A It is my belief that he did.

O Do you say that you are in a position to tell us his rool opinions and intentions as well as he could

tell them to us himself?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If your Honor please, we object to that question as calling for a conclusion of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled.

A May I have the question repeated?

("hereupon, the last question
was read by the Japanese court reporter.)

HE WITNESS: I can say with conviction -- I

can tell you of anything which Mr. HIROTA told me while

I was director of the East Asiatic Bureau. However, since
this was all over ten years ago -- since this all relates
to things that happened over ten years ago, there may
be some points on which my memory fails me.

You say in paragraph 2 of your affidavit, in the middle, "It was the firm resolution of Mr. HIROTA upon assuming the office of Foreign Minister to alleviate the oppressive tension attending the Sino-Japanese relations."

A That is so.

and in the first sentence of paragraph 3 you say, "Mr. HIROTA carried out his resolution steadily in every state of Japan's foreign relations."

Now listen to this and tell me whether it did

1 not represent HIROTA's real opinion and intention in October, 1933. immediately after he had assumed office: "I am constantly trying to work out a smooth relationship between diplomacy and national defense. In consequence of this, the war expenditure budget problem will become urgent. Then I intend to clarify my position, standing between as a third party. That is, we will expand our utmost by foreign policy, and when foreign policy arrives at its limits we will leave the matter to you, the army and navy, for disposal."

Now. did that not represent HIROTA's real opinions and intentions when he first took office as Foreign Minister in 1933?

I don't know when and in what connection I'r. HIROTA made such a statement, but J do know that in September, 1933, when Mr. HIROTA became Foreign Minister, he told me that because of the Manchurian Incident Sino-Japanese relations had reached a very critical stage and that it was his intention to bring about closer relations, betwon the two parties, and also to bring about friendly relations between third powers also, and that I'r. HIROTA considered this his sole mission as Foreign Minister.

2.1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

5

11

12

15

11

15

10

17

13

17

- Q You say you do not know when. I will suggest to you the precise date, 11 October 1933.
 - A May I ask where he made this statement?
- Q I suggest to you that he made it to Baron HALADA in the Foreign Ministry.
 - A I have never heard of such a statement.
- And that he made it following upon a Five Linisters Conference.

Now, were not the ministers who attended Five Minister Conferences at that time the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Finance Minister, the Mar Minister and the Mavy Minister?

THE INTERPRETER: Will you repeat that last question, please?

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter.)

- A On the whole, it is my recollection that those were the five ministers that composed that conference.
- And was it not HIROTA's policy throughout his holding of office to secure Japan's expansion by negotiation, if he could?
- A I am convinced that Mr. HIROTA never had any such ideas.
 - and to use threats and ultimatums by the army

as a means of securing compliance with his negotiation demands?

A When the army conducted negotiations directly with the Chinese, in my recollection never was there an instance when they consulted either with Foreign Minister HIROTA or with the Foreign Office.

Q That is hardly an answer to my question. Try again, please.

A May I have the question repeated, please?

(Whereupon, the last question was repeated by the Japanese court reporter.)

A Absolutely not.

And if pressure by threat was not sufficient, was he not prepared, when he thought the time suitable, to allow the army and navy to enforce his demands by force?

A He never allowed the army or navy to prepare for any such thing.

I should like to add that HIROTA's negotiations were all conducted through regular diplomatic channels.

Q Now, in paragraph 4 of your affidavit, in the middle, you are summarizing a conversation between Ambassador ARIYOSHI and Chinese Foreign Minister Wang in which the question of Manchukuo was raised, and you

7

9

10

8

11

12

. 15 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

23 24

11

17

18

19

say that ARIYOSHI told Wang that public opinion in Japan would not allow the government to retract the recognition of Manchukuo.

Do you say that that was HIROTA's opinion, or only ARIYOSHI's?

A I am convinced that it was not only Mr. HIROTA's opinion, or Mr. ARIYOSHI's opinion, but that it was public opinion in Japan at that time.

Q Do you mean by it that HIROTA was not in favor of extending or expanding Japan's control in Manchukuo?

year; I believe it was on the 15th of September 1933. Foreign Minister Wang often asked Mr. ARIYOSHI in his conversations that Japan withdraw such recognition. It was in reply to these requests that Mr. ARIYOSHI made the reply to which you have just referred, and therefore I am convinced that this reply which Mr. ARIYOSHI made had nothing at all to do with Japan's attitude towards Manchukuo itself, but was directed to showing the impossibility of Japan's withdrawing recognition once -- recognition which had already been granted.

Q Now, you go on to say that the main subject of conversation 'lay in how to harmonize the difficult

and contradictory standpoints of both governments with respect to the Manchukuo question. "

Do you think that the chances of harmonizing those two opinions were improved by the action taken in Manchukuo by the government of which HIROTA was a member?

A We had adopted the policy referred to in my affidavit because we felt that if the difficult questions pending between Japan and China at the time were set a side, or conversation on that topic was avoided for the time being and an effort to obtain a mutual understanding in other spheres was conducted, that the solution of these difficult problems themselves would become much simpler.

n 6 8 å

G

r

B

That I am suggesting putting to you, Mr. KTWASHIMA, is this: that HIROTA and the government of which he was a member took action throughout office so to strengthen Japan's grip on Manchukuo that it made it impossible for any peaceful negotiations with China to succeed; isn't that true?

My view of the matter is completely different from what you have suggested. At the time, I heard an amecdote relative to these ARIYOSHI-Wang negotiations. I de not know which of the two, Mr. ARIYOSHI or Mr. Wang, made this statement, but it seems one of them compared the nerotiations between Japan and China then going on at Nanking to a little rock -- a little boat, facing a rock, pulling its way along against an adverse current. The boat was truing to go upstream, and, therefore, if the rock could be avoided, sometime or other the bort would succeed in making its way upstream and in reaching its destination. This is a story I heard relative to these negotiations.

Now, did not the cabinet of which HIROTA was a member, in fact, greatly strengthen Japan's grip on Manchuvuo particularly for the purpose of securing raw material output there for Japan?

I do not know.

For instance, on the 22nd of December, 1933,

9 r t 0 n

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

10

20

21

14

18

22

23

24

25

did not your bureau -- the East /sia Bureau of the Foreign Office -- issue a decision of the cabinet of that day concerning preparations for enforcing the monarchy in Manchukuo? Don't you remember that?

A I am afraid I have no clear recollection on that point at this moment.

MR. COLMYNS CARR: That is exhibit 234, g record page 2933. I will not take up time with the o details.

Q Now, do you remember a controversy arising n with the United States, continuing from August, 1934 to the early part of April, 1935, about the establish-13 ment of an oil monopoly in Manchuria?

A I did hear about this matter. But, since the bureau conducting those negotiations at the time was 16 the Commerce Bureau of the Foreign Ministry, I do not know the details of that affair.

Q Do you know that on November 5, 1934 the 19 Foreign Ministry, that is, HIROTA, informed the American Government that the control of the oil industry in Manchuria was not within the knowledge or concern of the aponese Government --

A Since I have not heard that statement, I can tell you nothing about it.

Q (Continuing) -- on the ground that it was

the act of a state recognized by Japan as severeign and independent?

A I have heard nothing about this matter at that time. I think it was the because the Commerce Bureau was handling the matter.

MR. COMMAN CARR: Your Honor, that is exhibit 965, record page 9481; 939, record page 9406; and 941 record page 9413.

- Q If those statements were made by HIROTA, they were false to his knowledge and yours, weren't they?
- A As I have stated repeatedly to you, these matters were not within my confidence, and, therefore, I can tell you nothing about it.
- O I am suggesting to you that the actual facts were within your confidence and you know that the statements are false.
- A I can tell you with confidence as far as regards the structure of the Foreign Office. The Commerce Bureau handles economic matters, whereas the East
 Asia Bureau, my bureau, handled mainly political matters.
 - Q Did not your bureau issue the statement of a cabinet decision on the 20th of March, 1934, just a few months before these discussions began, entitled "The Summary of Japanese-Manchurian Economical Admin-

istration Folicy"?

A We may have issued such a statement relative to policy.

O Wasn't the statement declared to be for the purpose of establishing securely the base of Japan's world-wide economic expansion?

A As far as I have learned, the policy of -the economic policy of Japan vis-a-vis Manchukuo was
through -- peaceful exploitation of Manchurian resources to rean the fruits of happiness for both Manchukuo and Japan.

Q Did not the cabinet decision include the following: "Enterprises of the following kinds will be operated by special commanies which hold a dominant position among the said business in Manchukuo. Aera general rule, these will be directly or indirectly under the special protection and supervision of the Empire"? Do you remember that?

A I have no recollection in regard to details.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess
we taken until 1100, after which the proceelings were continued as follows:)

20.

heichers & Yelden

LIGHT THE COUNT: The International Lilitary Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, I find I must apologize to the Language Division for the misunderstanding that arose this morning. It appears that owing to some misunderstanding they were given the wrong documents and therefore the fault was not theirs.

THE MONITOR: Thank you, Mr. Comyns Carr. MR. COLYNS CARK: I expect it was my error.

I had just reed a passage, had I not, ending with the words, "under the special protection and supervision of the Empire"?

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Lid not the list of industries which were to be controlled in that manner as decided by the Cabinet include "No. 4, the petroleum industry"?

A I have no recollection on this point.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is exhibit 236, record page 2939.

Q Now, with regard to the economic control of Manchukuo, was there not an agreement between Japan and Manchukuo in July 1935? What do you say?

A My recollection on this point is not very clear.

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And did not Hirota attend the Privy Council of 3 July 1935 to explain it to them? I don't remember whether he attended the Privy Council or not. Q would you be one of the Foreign Office officials who would go with him if he went to the Privy Council? Of course, I do not remember just exactly who went on each occasion but I do remember that on economic metters it was the Director of the Commerce Bureau who accompanied the Foreign Minister. But where it was a question of concluding an agreement, would it not be in your province? Of course, when an agreement is actually signed Bureaus other than the competent bureau would be privileged to see the relevant document. However, since the matter was outside my jurisdiction, I do not remember it too distinctly. Do you not remember that there was to be a joint Manchukuo-Japanese Committee, to deal with all economic matters, of eight members? I do know that such a committee was set up in Lanchukuo. ? Four from each country?

And do you remember HIKOTA explaining to the

22

23

A Probably it was so.

Privy Council that it was quite all right because one of the Manchukuoan members would always be a Japanese who could be trusted to support the Japanese side?

A I do not recall whether he did or did not make such a statement.

MR. COLYNS CARR: It is exhibit 850, record page 8417, with perticular reference to pages 4, 6 and 7 of the document.

Now, I want to ask you about the AMAU statement, to which you refer in paragraph 5 of your affidavit. You say that HIROTA reprimended AMAU because of that statement.

- A Yes, I heard this from Mr. HIROTA himself.
- Was he punished?
- A I don't believe he did.
- Q What was wrong with it?

A I believe that what was wrong about this statement was that the Chief of the Information Bureau, AMAU, published this statement in the newspapers without first receiving the understanding of Foreign Minister HIROTA--

Q But it represented Japan's real policy, didn't it, in contrast with the public statements HIROTA was making himself?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

5

8

10

11

4

12

13

14

16

17

19

20 21

22

MR. YAMAOKA: If your Honor please, I don't believe the witness had completed his answer before Mr. Carr asked his next question.

THE PRESIDERT: If he did not, let him do so.

A (Continued) Besides the fact that Mr. AMAU did not gain Mr. HIROTA's approval before announcing his statement, it is my belief that AMAU's statement was not in harmony with Japan's foreign policy at that time.

Q But you have told us that it consisted of what you call a patchwork of telegraphic instructions which had, in fact, been sent to the Japanese representatives in China.

A I shall have to explain the facts of the situation as it existed then. From the summer of 1932 the League of Nations sent experts regarding help and also regarding economics to China.

2-1

Q Mr. Witness, please do not repeat what you have already said in your affidavit about this. If you want to say anything fresh, do; but do not merely repeat.

A At the time the Foreign Office received repeated information from our representatives in China that Mr. Monnet, to whom I referred in my affidavit, was drafting a plan for international help to China from which Japan was to be excluded and therefore, in order to get Mr. Monnet to stop this plan or at least to put it off for the time being, our Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs announced that such a plan would have no good results for China and also that the execution of such a plan with the exclusion of Japan would be utterly unacceptable to Japan. With such a view the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs sent telegraphic instructions to carry on negotiations with Mr. Monnet on that basis to Ambassador ARIYOSHI in Nanking--

Q All that is merely repetition of what you have said.

A --and also to the consul-general in Shanghai. Therefore this telegram was sent merely as an indication of how to conduct negotiations in order to get Mr. Monnet to stop his plan or at least to put it off

and certainly does not represent Japanese foreign policy.

THE PRESIDENT: A colleague desires to know whether the reprimand of AMAU was a punishment.

MR. COMYNS CARR: All that is merely repetition of what you have said in the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: I did not get an answer to my colleague's question.

THE MONITOR: He is about to answer, sir.

IR. COMYNS CARR: I beg your Honor's pardon.

THE WITNESS: According to Japanese law a reprimand is classed as a punishment; however, I do not know whether in this case this so-called punishment came within that category or not.

THE PRESIDENT: Was not a record made of it? THE WITNESS: At least it is among the records of my bureau that Mr. HIROTA reprimanded Mr. AMAU.

- Q Was the reprimand made public?
- A In my recollection it was not.
- Q Was not AMAU's real fault that he had disclosed to the world what the Japanese Foreign Office was doing in secret?
- In my view it furnished an indication to the representatives in China in conducting negotiations

7

8

9 10

11 12:

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

24

with Mr. Monnet with a view to discouraging his activities relative to his economic plan for China and did not represent the foreign policy of the Imperial Japanese Government.

I should like to add a few words.

This was an instruction sent relative only to Mr. Monnet's activity and did not concern general policy.

THE PRESIDENT: Did HIROTA publicly announce that the AMAU statement was contrary to government policy?

THE WITNESS: According to my recollection the so-called AMAU statement appeared in the morning papers on the 17th of April and in a press conference two or three days later Mr. HIROTA declared that such was not the policy of the Japanese Government. Furthermore, immediately after this unofficial statement of AMAU appeared, the American ambassador and the British ambassador in Tokyo both appeared at the Foreign Office one after another to ask about the matter, and in reply to these inquiries I believe either Mr. HIROTA or the Vice Minister on HIROTA's instructions met these ambassadors and told them more or less the same thing that I have described in court today.

Q Was not AMAU's real fault for which he was

reprimanded, if he was reprimanded, that he had been so careless as to disclose to the public the instructions that were being sent to the Japanese representatives in China?

I believe that he was reprimanded not only
for having been careless but also for the fact that
he had made his statement in such a way as to cast
suspicion on Japan that that was the real foreign
policy whereas it was not.

Q If you say it was not the real foreign
policy, do you mean that it was an instruction to the
representatives in China to make false statements to
Mr. Monnet?

A That is not so.

Were you present in the Foreign Ministry on the 17th of April 1934, that is the very morning when the statement appeared, when Baron HARADA called and had an interview with HIROTA, the Foreign Minister, and SHIGEF 3U, the Vice Minister.

A I was in the Foreign Office on the 17th of April; however, I do not know whether Baron HARADA visited Foreign Minister HIROTA on that day.

Did HIROTA and SHIGE TITSU both say to Baron HARADA with regard to the AMAU statement, it is nothing serious?

A Since I do not know the fact of Baron HARADA's actually coming to the Foreign Office, I was not actually present at the conversation if it did ta place and therefore I can tell you nothing about it.

Ö

18.

2.

(, Had	the i	nstr	uctio	ons w	hich	you	have	told	us
about	been s	ent no	t on	ly to	the	repr	esen	tativ	es of	
	in Chi									
	als of									

In my recollection, it was sent only to our diplomatic representative in China.

Now, I want to refer to paragraphs 8 and 12, the part of 12 that was read, of your affidavit.

With regard to the Ho-UMEZU Agreement, was there not a time limit set?

I do not know about that. A

When you speak in paragraph 8 about the enforcement of conditions with an ultimatum, were you not referring amongst other instances to the Ho-UMEZU Agreement?

As I have already said, I know nothing about the Ho-UMEZU Agreement. But since I had heard through documents that in regard to many other minor negotiations they were carried out with ultimatums, I included that in my affidavit -- time limits.

THE MONITOR: Put in time limits.

- Do you draw a distinction between what you call a strong demand with a time limit and an ultimatum?
- . Since I, myself, have never conducted or participated in such types of negotiations, I really

15

16

7

9

10

11

13

15

17

19

cannot say. However, my interpretation is that in an ultimatum, the right is reserved to take free action after the expiration of the time limit. In the case of a demand with a time limit, I believe it is merely a demand to reply within a certain period of time.

Q Did not you know that the demands to which you have referred were, in fact, accompanied by a threat of military action at the end of the time limit?

A As far as I can recollect, they were demands made with a time limit; a demand to reply by a certain day of a certain month.

Q Then why do you speak of them in your affidavit as an ultimatum?

A Yes, I did use the word "ultimatum," and as I have just said, I believe that it is more or less the same as -- in this case it was used in the sense of time limit. However, since at that time in the Foreign Office documents coming in and going out referred repeatedly to ultimatums, I included the term in my afficavit.

Q Is the distinction in your mind between a time limit and an ultimatum this, that when the threat of force is only bluff, you call it a time limit, and when it is really intended in your own minds, you call it an ultimatum?

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

- A I believe it is exactly as you have said.
- Q I see. Well, now, when the agitation, shall we call it, in favor of an independent North China was fomented by the Japanese in November 1935, do you remember, as you have stated in paragraph 12 of your affidavit, that the Kwantung Army was concentrating its mechanized troops at Shanghaikwan with a view to intimidating North China?
- A I do remember. Furthermore, I should like to state that although you said that Japan was conducting agitation to fomant a movement for independence in North China, it was not actually Japan that was doing this.
 - Q Who was it?
- A as appears in my affidavit, at the time I received information to the effect that it was carried on by junior officers of the Kwantung Army.
 - Q Why do you say junior officers?
- A At the time there was a branch office of the consulate at Tientsin at Shanghaikwan and a vice-consul was stationed there, and I received information from that vice-consul. On receiving such information from the vice-consul at Shanghaikwan, I, as Director of the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs, immediately called on the central military authorities to express my strong

.

13

11

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

disapproval and to state that such action was indeed alarming, such news was indeed alarming. At that time, the central military authority concerned told me that there was no intention on their part to threaten China.

You have not, as you said just now, stated in your iffidavit that this was the work of junior officers. On the contrary, you state that it was the work of the Japanese military authorities in China, and in another place, the Kwantung Army.

Q Why do you now tell us that you said that it was the work of junior officers?

A As I have stated before, in the report from the vice consul at Shanghaikwan words were used to the effect that that was the ideology of the junior officers, and also since at that time the central military authorities told me that the tendency then was that junior officers were trying to set themselves up against their superiors.

Q Do you suggest that the mechanized troops of the Kwantung Army could be concentrated at Shanghai-kwan on the Great Wall without the orders of MINAMI and ITAGAKI?

A I do not know.

Q Now, was HIROTA's action about that this: Did he, first of all, obtain a promise from General MINAMI t at the troops would not actually be sent beyord Shanghaikwan without an Imperial command?

A I have no clear recollection on this point.

I do remember that the liason officers of the central rilitary authorities with whom I was in contact told me repeatedly words to the same effect.

Q Did HIROTA then give instructions to the Foreign Office officials that that fact, namely, that the troops wouldn't move without an Imperial command,

9

14

10

11

12

13

17

18

16

19

20

21

23 24

must on no account be allowed to leak out to China?

A I have no recollection of ever having received orders to such an effect or instructions to such an effect from Mr. HIROTA.

Q "ere the two reasons given: one, that if it leaked out to China the Chinese would start causing trouble and take the Japanese for fools?

A I remember having heard something to that effect from the army authorities with whom I was then in corect.

Q And was HIROTA's other reason for taking extreme precautions that it didn't leak out, that if it did leak out that the army would be very angry with him?

A I have no recollection.

Q You know very well, do you not, that the army, both the North China Army and the Kwantung Army had threatened that if the new independent councils for Hopeh-Chahar and for East Hopeh were not established by a named day military action would be taken by Japan?

A I have never heard any such thing.

Q Did you not learn that on the 18th of Novemb , 1935, DOHIHARA had announced in China, at Peking I think, that if autonomy for the North was

5

1

9

11

10

12

14

16 17

19

20

21 22

23

not proclaimed he was prepared to send five Japanese divisions into Hopeh and six into Shantung?

- A I have never heard any such thing.
- Q Had you not learned that the North China authorities or on behalf of the North China Army General DOHINARA had fixed an ultimatum to expire at noon on the 21st of November if the formal proclamation of the autonomous state was not issued?
 - A I do not know.
- Q Had you not learned that on the same day DOHIHARA had informed the newspaper men assembled in Peking that he expected a formal announcement of the new regime shortly?
- A That also I do not know. I should like to add a few words. Until the actual establishment of the East Hopeh anti-comintern autonomous regime and the Hopeh-Chahar political council, the Foreign Office in Tokyo, and more particularly the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs of which I was director, knew nothing either verbally or through documents of the proposed establishment of such regimes.
- Q Did not you personally make a collection which was filed in the Foreign Office of American and other newspaper reports dealing with this matter?
 - A Maybe my subordinates collected such reports.

However, I, mysulf, as director did not see did
not know anything about these two regimes until they
had been established.
Q Look at the document which is being handed
to you. Is that your seal on it?
A Yes.
Q And does it also bear the seal of SHIGE-
MITSU?
A Since I am not SHIGENITSU I cannot say with
certainty.
Q Does it look like it?
A It does look like it. However, I cannot say
for sure.
Q You have seen it often enough, haven't you?
A Therefore, I have stated that it certainly
looks like SHIGEMITSU's seal.
Q Is it addressed to HIROTA?
A This is a report sent from Charge d'Affaires
FUJI in London to Mr. HIROTA.
MR. COMYNS CARR: I now ask that that be
marked as an exhibit, your Honor, and admitted into
evidence.
THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
CLERK OF THE COURT: IPS document 1517-A will
noncitto enlett ti

2-

receive exhibit No. 3242.

(Whereupon, the document above
referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 3242 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until
half-past one.

(Thereupon, at 1200, a recess
was taken.)

2-1

AFTERNOON SESSION

he Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's per-7 mission, the accused KAYA will be absent from the courtroom for the whole of the afternoon session conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

11

13

14

10

12 KAZUE KUWASHIMA, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

15 16

17

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor please, we are now in a position to circulate copies of exhibit 3242, which was admitted just before the adjournment.

18 19

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Will you read it then? MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading):

20 21

"Nov. 16, 1935 from London

22

"Nov. 17, 1935 arrived at the Ministry

25

"To: Foreign Minister HIROTA

24 25

"From: Acting Ambassador FUJII"

Containing the seals of SHIGEMITSU, Vice

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Minister, KUWASHIMA, the present witness, East Asia Bureau, AMAU, Information Bureau.

"With reference to the previous telegram, No. 357.

"Since then, on the China problem, the newspapers, with the exception of one or two of the Labor Party, became more quiet. However, considerable attention was aroused by the reports that:

"(1) With regard to the North China problem, there were reports on the situation of the independent movement on the part of the Japanese military authorities. North China had come under the control of Japan.

"(2) The landing of Japanese Marines in Shanghai did not give a shock to the Chinese residents, etc., etc."

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Now, Mr. KUWASHIMA, did not your bureau make and file a large collection of these newspaper reports, both American and British, about what was happening in North China?

A I have no recollection of my bureau having made any file of newspaper reports, but I do remember that at the time we received many press telegrams from our representatives in Europe and America.

Well, now, you'd better just look at the file.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q (Continuing) Is that not a file of newspaper reports on this subject, made in your section?

A This collection is one that was compiled by the Info ation Bureau and does not belong to my bureau.

Q Just look at this document, if you say that.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q (Continuing) Does not that bear the seal of your section, your bureau?

A It does bear the seal of my section, that is, the East Asia Bureau. However, this file was compiled by the Information Bureau. It bears the seal of the Chief of the First Section of the Information Bureau.

Q Did not the newspaper cuttings come to your bureau, and were they not, after you had studied them, sent to the Information Bureau for filing?

A In my recollection, that was not the case.
All news, per and magazine reports went direct to the
Information Bureau and from the Information Bureau was
circulated among the various interested bureaus.

Q Including your own?

A Yes.

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

21

23

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Do you notice that the document I have just handed to you is addressed to Foreign Minister HIROTA from Ambassador ARIYOSHI in China? Yes. MP. COMYNS CARR: I ask that the document be exhibit and circulated. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1517-B will receive exhibit No. 3242-A. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3242-A and received in evidence.) MR. COMYNS CARR (Reading): "22 Nov. 1935 "From: Ambassador ARIYOSHI, in China "To: Foreign Minister HIROTA "Attached Document received 27 Nov. 1935, with the seal of the Information Bureau, and the seal of the East Asia Bureau. "With Regard to the North China Autonomous

Movement

"With regard to this subject, the gist of the editorial in the 'Journal de Shanghai' was reported to you on 21 Nov. 1935. Its full text is hereby forwarded to you for your reference."

ВУ

3

6

8

10

12

13

11

14

17

16

19

20

18

21

22

23

24 25 BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Now, whichever bureau got these newspaper reports first, did not you study them?

A I am quite sure that our bureau did see them.

& And, did you not report to Foreign Minister HIROTA on their contents?

A I don't recall exactly. However, even if we did 't report it direct to the Foreign Minister, I am sure we did report it to the Vice Minister.

That was the accused SMIGEMITSU, wasn't it?

A Yes.

Q And, have you forgotten that the reports contained all the matters which I was asking you about this morning?

A Since the reports were -- since these reports reached a large number, it is difficult for me to recall at this date just exactly what their contents were, these newspaper and telegraphic reports.

Q Did you not know, either from the newspapers or from your consuls, the three matters I asked you about this morning?

A May I have those three things repeated?

4 I will remind you. Did you not know, either from the Evening Post of 18 November 1935 or from your consular reports, that General DOHIHARA had announced

that if the autonomy for the North was not proclaimed he was prepared to send five Japanese divisions into Hopeh and six into Shantung?

A It is not in my recollection at all.

You will find it in the file, if you look for it.

Did you not know, either from the Evening Post of November 20, 1935, or from your consuls that General DOHIHARA had announced that the ultimatum given to the North China authorities would expire at noon the next day?

A It is not in my recollection.

Q Was that not one of the ultimatums to which you were referring in paragraph 8 of your affidavit?

A Of course, it does include that ultimatum. However, I do not know about the details of the events occurring in those times -- in those days. I did not know at the time of events occurring then.

Q Did you not know, either from the Daily News of November 20, 1935, or from your consuls, that General DOHIHARA about that date informed the newspapermen that he expected a formal announcement of the new regime by the Chinese authorities shortly?

A I have no recollection.

Q The particular Daily News I am referring to is the Los Angeles Daily News.

Now, do you say that it wasn't part of the policy of the Foreign Ministry to support the Army in this move for compelling the Chinese to establish an

14

11

12

13

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

autonomous government in North China?

A It was not.

Q On or about the 19th of November, 1935, did not Vice-Minister SHIGEMITSU have an interview with Mr. Ting who, I think, was a member of the Chinese Embassy in Japan?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Prosecutor, how do you spell Ting, T-i-n-g?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you finished that question, Mr. Comyns Carr?

MR. COMYNS CARR: For the moment, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we object to that as being outside the scope of the direct examination of this -- direct testimony of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: He covered very fully the operations of the accused HIROTA as Foreign Minister.

Now he is dealing with what was done by the Vice-Minister.

Wasn't SHIGEMITSU the Vice-Minister at the same time as HIROTA was Foreign Minister?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

MR. FURNESS: I don't think he was at all times,

sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Wasn't he so in November, 1935?

12

9

10

14

1

18

20 21

22

23

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Do you remember that interview?

A Can you tell me what the interview was about? I may be able to recall.

Q Did it not follow upon a message received by HIROTA from the Chinese Ambassador, Mr. Chieng, to the effect that it was the profound desire of the Nanking Government to have a sound and sincere promotion of the negotiations for the improvement of Sino-Japanese relations?

A Are you asking me if I know about the circumstances in which Consular Ting or Charge D'affaires Ting brough this message to the Foreign Minister?

Q What I was asking you was whether he didn't bring such a message on the 18th of November, and whether he didn't have an interview with SHIGEMITSU following that on the 19th?

A I don't recall.

Q Did not SHIGEMITSU say to Ting that he wanted to caution China, particularly about her activities in North China?

A I do not know.

Q And did he not say that the Chinese people in

10

12

13

14 15

16

18

19

21

22 23

24

North China might have distinct political and economic ambitions?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, this witness has already stated repeatedly that he is ignorant of the meeting about which he is being questioned at the moment and, in our submission, I can't see that asking him further questions along the line followed by my learned friend is being very helpful.

THE PRESIDENT: He professes to know so much about HIROTA's operations as Foreign Minister, that I think he might be subjected to a little pressure.

Q Did not that represent the policy of HIROTA?

A As I already stated this morning, I am convinced that Mr. HIROTA's China policy consisted of an endeavor to effectuate conciliation and cooperation between the two nations and in the meantime to avoid -- to take steps to prevent the Army in China taking such action as would prevent such conciliation.

Q See, I am suggesting to you that on the contrary the Foreign Ministry, you, HIROTA and SHIGEMITSU, were yourselves pushing this policy and using this Army's threats in order to get it adopted.

A That is absolutely not so.

Kapleau & Knapp

3

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	Q	Would	iit	be:	righ	t for	· SHIGEM	ITSU ·	to say	7
that	it	ight	be	true	to	some	extent,	that	this	was
the :	resu:	Lt of	a	Japan	ese	plot	?			

A I cannot believe so.

Would it be in accordance with HIROTA's policy for SHIGEMITSU to say this to Mr. Ting, that for North China to meet her development properly she must strive for the harmonious rapprochement of Japan, China and Manchukuo?

A It goes without saying that of course it was necessary that Sino-Japanese conciliation be effective not only in North China but all ever China, and especially since NorthaChina bordered the State of Manchukuo, that was all the more so.

Q Did SHIGEMITSU complain that the Nanking Government was assembling troops on the Shanghaikuan Hopeh line in an effort to oppose Japan?

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I happen to know what document Mr. Comyns Carr is cross-examining from. I happen to know, further, that what he just stated is an absolute misquotation of that document. I think it is most unfair to this witness and to the defendants in the dock.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr?

22

24

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission it will be time enough for my friend to make observations like that when the document is tendered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, he can always examine the witness himself.

We do not know what document you are using. You may be using some other source of information, for all we know.

MR. FURNESS: I will say, then, that I am confident that he is examining from the so-called HARADA-SAIONJI Memoirs.

THE PRESIDENT: You can clear up anything that has been misrepresented later when you examine the witness, Major Furness.

Q Did Mr. Ting deny the truth of that suggestion?

A As I have repeatedly told you, I do not remember at all about this so-called conversation between Vice-Minister SHIGEMITSU and Councillor Ting, and therefore I am sorry I can tell you nothing about it.

Q You were in constant touch, I suppose, with Vice-Minister SHIGEMITSU as well as with HIROTA, were you not?

4

6

1

7 8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

A Yes.

3

1

2

statement today

4

5

6

S

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

23 24

22

25

Q Would this represent the policy of both of them? "I would like to have the army make an autonomy

statement today."

THE INTERPRETER: Will you repeat that statement, please?

MR. COMYNS CARR: "I would like to have the army make an autonomy statement today." It was a statement with regard to autonomy for North China.

I will go on before you answer.

Q "I would like to send the Kwantung Army into Shanghaikuan and Hopeh to put a scare into them, and to have the army make an autonomous statement as soon as possible. I would like to have everything done the way the army wants it before the Emperor returns."

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I also have this document, which in fact is the same document, before me.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think you should read it now. As I said before, you will be able to examine the witness. This document is not in evidence and we have no way of checking it until it is. We are handicapped. I understand it is the SAIONJI Diary -- the HARADA Diary.

MR. FURNESS: It is, in this case, mistranslated, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: You have full liberty to refer any document like that which you say is mistralsted to Major Moore.

MR. FURNESS: It is not in evidence, your Honor, and I am not sure that I intend to cross-examine this witness on a conference which he says he knows nothing about.

THE PRESIDENT: In all events we cannot clear up the question between you at this stage because the document is not in evidence, but it is the wish of every Member that you should allow the crossexamination to proceed as regards this phase, Major Furness. If the document were in evidence, we would have no difficulty.

MR. FURNESS: By my silence, if your Honor please, I do not wish to have it inferred that I admit that this document is admissible.

Q Now, will you answer the question, Witness, whether those statements did not represent the real policy of the Foreign Office, that is to say of both HIROTA and SHIGEMITSU?

A as I have already told you, I know nothing about the reported conversation between Vice-Minister

SHIGEMITSU and Councillor Ting.

Q One moment -- this has nothing to do with that conversation. What I am suggesting to you is now another statement by SHIGEMITSU to Baron HARADA on the same day, the 19th of November.

A And I am convinced that Mr. SHIGEMITSU could never have made such a statement.

Q Did not HIROTA himself say on the same day that he would like to have the decoration in North China, that is the autonomy decoration, issued at such a time that it would not aggravate the Nanking Government?

A No, I have never heard him make such a statement.

Q Now, only one other matter, I think, that I need ask you about. I will just be sure. Oh, no, there are two.

You say, in paragraph 13 of your affidavit, that meanwhile, that is, during the same period when this North China autonomy business was going on, that the negotiations for the improvement of Sino-Japanese relations were making steady progress.

A By "meanwhile" I did not mean during the same period while the negotiations for the autonomy move-ment were going on, but meanwhile, in a general sort

3 4 5

of way. I just meant to say that the relations between Japan and China continued to improve in a general sort of way.

,

at the end of December, 1935?

A ves.

O Did the Manking Government express at that time an earnest desire to talk matters over and to open a Nanking conference?

A At the time the Kuomintang government of China said it was prepared to accept HIROTA's principles as the basis of negotiations, but that because of various incidents breaking out in North China it was very difficult to continue negotiations. I received this report in a telegram.

O For whom was it difficult to continue them, the Chinese Government or the Japanese Government?

making this representation, of course it was difficult for the Chinese Government to continue the negotiations, and if it was difficult for the Chinese side it was difficult at least for those officials of the Japanese Government who were actually conducting the negotiations, that is to say, the Foreign Office and our diplomatic representatives in China.

n But if the Chinese Government were willing in spite of what had happened in North China to continue the negotiations, why was HIROTA not willing?

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

64

2)

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

A I have no recollection that HIROTA was not willing.

O Did you not say that he was hesitating about giving China any decisive reply?

A I have never heard such a thing.

And that his reply to them was, "Let us consider this matter only after anti-Japanese movements are well under control"?

A May I ask you what this matter pertains to?

O The proposal made by the Chinese Government for a Nanking conference.

A Mr. HIROTA never told me that he was not willing to continue negotiations with China unless anti-Japanese movements were given up, nor have I myself ever heard
of any such thing.

Now a question about paragraph 23 of your affidavit.

You say that the Foreign Office was anchoring its hope upon the future development of negotiations when there broke out the so-called Suiyuan Incident owing to the activities of a part of the Kwantung Army in Inner Mongolia. That was in December, 1936, when HIROTA was the premier, wasn't it?

A Yes.

Q Did you know the premier's, HIROTA's, attitude

13

14

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

with regard to the Sulyuan matter?

A I do know that HIROTA regretted exceedingly the outbreak of this incident.

Would this correctly represent it? "Probably a military operation will be impossible in the Suiyuan area due to the weather conditions. Therefore I want the problem settled diplomatically. We should have the determination to take action in the event that the Chinese Central Army should enter Chahar."

"Tas that a correct representation of HIROTA's real views about this Suiyuan Incident?

A I being a bureau chief in the Foreign Ministry, have never expressed my views directly to Mr. HIROTA, who had then already become premier.

THE INTERPRETER: I being a mere bureau chief of the Foreign Ministry, never asked Mr. HIROTA about his opinion concerning the Suiyuan Incident; but it is my view that since Mr. HIROTA while Foreign Minister had striven so earnestly for Japanese-Chinese rapprochement it was but natural that he would try to solve the Suiyuan and Chahar Incident also through peaceful diplomatic negotiations.

O Suiyman is in Inner Mongolia, isn't it -- part of the territory which you called Inner Mongolia?

A Yes.

3

4

5

6

.7

'8

9

10

U

12

13

15

16

17

O Did not the Japanese establish in that area an independent regime under Prince Teh?

A I have never heard to this date to what extent the Japanese Government was concerned, if it was
concerned at all, with the affairs of the Mongolia
autonomous regime. But I have heard that the Kwantung
Army did have considerable interest in this regime from
the viewpoint of maintaining peace and order in Manchuria
and also from other viewpoints.

"as one of the other viewpoints that it was a convenient place from which to attack Outer Mongolia?

A I do not make my statement with that in mind. From the viewpoint of maintaining peace and order in Mongolia, yes, but as to the other viewpoints, I stated them in a general way because I did not know what they were.

 $\ensuremath{\text{O}}$ Now I am suggesting to you that that was one of them.

A I don't know anything about this matter.

Q "ould it correctly represent the policy of HIROTA's government to say that a subordinate of Prince Teh had made a secret overture to the Chinese Central Army and therefore HIROTA did not think that the combat morale of the enemy would be very high?

A From the information I obtained at the time

18

20

21

22

24

and from the observations T was able to make, I gathered that the Japanese Government and the central military authorities knew nothing about this incident right up to the moment when it actually occurred, and I still believe so.

1.1

G r 0 0 n b r g 33 B 8 rt 0 n 10 11 13

Q When do you say it did actually occur?

A The first time I heard about -- the first news I heard of this incident was that the Inner Mongolian troops had invaded Eastern Chahar from Suiyuan and had there suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Chine - Nationalist Army.

I am asking you when you say you first heard about this incident. Can you give the date?

A I cannot tell you the exact date since I have no exact recollection.

O These Inner Mongolian troops that you speak of were working, were they not, in conjunction with the Kwantung Army?

A As far as I know the Kwantung Army itself did not participate in this battle.

Nould you answer the question: Were not these so-called Inner Mongolian troops operating in conjunction with the Kwantung Army?

A I took your question to mean that you were asking me whether the Kwantung Army cooperated with the Inner Mongolian Army in fighting the Chinese. Is that so?

Q Now will you answer it?

A I have never heard anything to that effect.

Q Now, the last matter: Let me repeat to you

4...

19

19

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

the first question I put to you and will you tell me now whether you do not agree that it represented HIROTA's policy from the beginning. "We will expand our utmost by foreign policy, and when foreign policy arrives at its limits we will leave the matter to you, the /rmy and Navy, for your disposal." Wasn't that, as shown by subsequent events, his real policy?

A All of us in the Foreign Office from HIROTA down were convinced that we should strive to remove the obstacles which the Army was constantly putting in the way of effecting diplomatic negotiations with China and to try to settle outstanding issues with that country through diplomatic negotiations, and we were convinced that these negotiations would bear fruit.

examination, your Honor. Before I leave the lectern I would just like to correct a mistake I am told I made on Friday with regard to the matter of the Chinese Eastern Railway. Contrary to what I then said, it is a part of the case for the prosecution that the provocative and subversive acts of the Japanese in connection with that railway began from the time when the Japanese irst came into Lanchukuo. Therefore, if my friend has any further evidence which he desires to present on that point, we shall not object to it.

23.

THE PRESIDENT: Wasn't there a question as to whether the sale was under duress?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor, in the sense of being instigated or contributed to by provocative acts on the sea.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

IR. T. OKAMOTO: I have one question to ask of the witness.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

Q To the last question put to you by the prosecutor, Mr. Witness, you replied that the Foreign Office did its best to eliminate all the obstacles put forward by the Army in the way of peaceful negotiations.

Now, Mr. Witness, did MINAMI, according to you, constitute one of those obstacles?

A I did not mean to limit my answer by any means to an individual such as General -- to any specific individual such as General MINAMI.

MR. COMYNY CARR: Your Honor, I think we ought to object to this line of re-examination. My friend has cross-examined the witness once on this subject already, and I am not aware that the witness has said anything fresh with regard to MINAMI under cross-examination.

5

6

7

8

()

10

11

12

15

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

THE PRESIDENT: The question does not suggest that he did, but it does suggest MINAMI may be included.

MR. COMYN: CARR: Yes, your Honor, but that was in the original affidavit, and my friend has already crass-examined about it. There is nothing fresh.

THE PRESIDENT: The question wasn't required to explain anything arising out of the cross-examination.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: If the purport of the prosecutor's question does not include MINAMI and if the answer of the witness did not include MINAMI among those who were constituted obstacles to the negotiations, I shall readily withdraw the question.

THE PRESIDENT: He did not say that he did not include him originally. I am referring to paragraph 8 of the affidavit, but the cross-examination has not worsened your position in that regard.

MR. COMYNS CARR: My friend having already cross-examined the witness is, in our submission, not entitled to re-examine him. The most he could be entitled to do would be to present further cross-examination on some new matter stated by the witness in the course of this cross-examination.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: In accordance with the

25 24

THE PRESIDENT: The question does not suggest that he did, but it does suggest MINAMI may be included.

MR. COMYN: CARR: Yes, your Honor, but that was in the original affidavit, and my friend has already crass-examined about it. There is nothing fresh.

THE PRESIDENT: The question wasn't required to explain anything arising out of the cross-examina-tion.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: If the purport of the prosecutor's question does not include MINAMI and if the answer of the witness did not include MINAMI among those who were constituted obstacles to the negotiations', I shall readily withdraw the question.

THE PRESIDENT: He did not say that he did not include him originally. I am referring to paragraph 8 of the affidavit, but the cross-examination has not worsened your position in that regard.

MR. COMYNS CARR: My friend having already cross-examined the witness is, in our submission, not entitled to re-examine him. The most he could be entitled to do would be to present further cross-examination on some new matter stated by the witness in the course of this cross-examination.

MR. T. OKAMOTO: In accordance with the

12

5

6

8

9

10

13

13

15

17

ts

18

20

22

25

wishes of the Tribunal I shall withdraw the question.

MR. KATO: Counsel KATO representing the defendant DOHIHARA. I have one or two points that I wish to clear up with this witness in cross-examination.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KATO:

5

6

8

10

11

12

15

14

20

21

22

23

24

Q In paragraph 12 of your affidavit, Mr. Witness, you refer to the East Hopei Autonomous Government under Yin Ju-keng and the Hopei-Chahar Political Council of Sung Cheh-yuan. You further state that the Japanese Foreign Ministry -- although the Japanese Foreign Ministry was opposed to the East Hopei Autonomous Government it was not particularly opposed to the Hepei-Chahar Political Council. Now, I wish to ask of you, Mr. Witness, the differences, if there are any, in policies or doctrines entertained by those two regimes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In my submission, your Honor, that doesn't arise out of any cross-examination by me or the evidence in chief.

MR. KATO: I am testing the witness' credibility.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.

tion.

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. KATO: I will pass on to the next ques-

Then do you know, Mr. Witness, as to the motive as well as the outcome brought about -- motive for establishment of the North China Political Council and the Fung Cheh-yuan and its outcome?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I make the same objection, your Honor.

(Continuing) Did the accused DOHIHARA have anything to do with the establishment -- the setting up of the East Hopei Autonomous Government?

I have never heard that DOHIHARA had anything to do with the East Hopei Regime.

MR. KATO: That is all, your Honor. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

> (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

20

21

22

23 24

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, there will be no further examination of this witness on behalf of the accused HIROTA. May we request his release on the usual terms?

> THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. YAMAOKA: We next offer in evidence defense document 2220. This is an official document of the Japanese Foreign Office compiled in May 1934 by the Tureau of Asiatic Affairs. It gives a resume of important problems pending between Japan and China which had been solved through the efforts of Mr. HIROTA in an effort gradually to improve overall relations between the two countries.

We do not intend to read this document; however, at the same time we desire to delete from it paragraphs one to three, inclusive, for the reason that the matters therein contained relate to events prior to Mr. HIROTA's assumption of office as Foreign Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Prosecution objects, your

24

Honor, to the remainder of the document on the ground that it contains a lot of detailed information about some very minor matters which appear to have been settled by negotiation between the Japanese and Chinese overnments and is sufficiently referred to in the affidavit of the last witness in paragraph 4, the first two sentences. In our submission, it is unnecessary to cumber the record, even though it is not to be read, with small matters like this in detail.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we respectfully submit that this substantiates the testimony of the last witness.

THE PRESIDENT: That part of the affidavit was not contested in the cross-examination, if I recollect rightly; that is to say, the first two sentences of paragraph 4.

MR. YAMAOKA: That may be so, if your Honor please. On the other hand, I desire to point out that Counts 1 to 5 of the Indictment, that is, the conspiracy counts, and also Appendix A, Section 3, of the Indictment do indicate that these economic matters are of importance.

THE PRESIDENT: It seems to be repetitive, Mr. Yamaoka; unnecessary details of what is already stated in the affidavit of the last witness and not

1_

contested. I do not think any Member wants to admit it.

MR. YAMAOKA: For the purpose of the record, may I have it rejected then?

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: We next offer in evidence defense document 2215. This is a telegram from Consul-General SUMA to Mr. HIROTA as Minister for Foreign 'ffairs on April 20, 1934.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, a summary of this document occupies the remainder of paragraph 4 of the last witness' affidavit and although I cross-examined about matters arising out of one sentence of that affidavit I did not challenge the accuracy of the summary of the document and the document contains nothing of importance beyond what is in the summary.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in our submission this is an important telegram showing the commencement of the discussions between Foreign Minister Wang and Foreign Minister HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Is it not sufficiently covered by the uncontested part of paragraph 4 of that

3

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

affidavit? It seems to be covered by the last decision, Mr. Yamaoka.

The objection is sustained and the document rejected by a majority.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I had not quite finished. I did desire to point out that this document is the basis for the later HIROTA's three principles and we thought it of sufficient importance to present it to the Tribunal so that it would have the benefit of the entire story of how these negotiations were started by Mr. Wang and that --

THE PRESIDENT: I think, in view of what you said, since this is the basis for the three principles, we will cancel that decision and admit the document on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2215 will receive exhibit No. 3243.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3243 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I will read defense exhibit

"Telegram sent from Nanking and received by the Department of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo, on April 20, 1934.

3243:

"From Consul-General SUMA to HIROTA, the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"No. 368 (Confidential)

"Following is addressed to you from Minister ARIYOSHI.

"On the eighteenth when I saw Wang Ching-wei, in continuation of the talks reported by telegrams
No. 366 and No. 367 sent to Your Excellency through the Cov. ul-General, Nanking, I had conversation with him as follows:

"1. I told Wang that it is a matter of satisfaction that the conversation on the subject of radio communication between Japan and China has already been started and that negotiation on this matter is making amicable progress. If we make progress in settling other questions successively in this manner and thereby demonstrate by facts the restoration of the relations between our two countries it will greatly contribute towards the improvement of the situation. I further explained to him the peaceful policy taken up by Your Excellency ever since you have assumed the duties as Minister for Foreign Affairs, and I explained also the interview which Your Excellency gave to American correspondents with regard to Japan's attitude toward China. Then I told

him if there be any wish or desire, etc., on his side which he wants to lay before our side I shall transmit such to the Minister for Foreign Affairs on my return to Japan and shall carefully confer with the Minister.

"2. Wang stated that with regard to Foreign Minister HIROTA's international peace policy he himself has great admiration, and, in consequence, he entertains a desire to take steps on this opportunity to promote in some way the improvement of the relations of our two countries. Wang proceeded further, making introductory remarks that what he states is in fact not at all in the nature of a diplomatic proposal but he intends to put it forward by way of consultation. Then he stated that in order to improve the relations he thought it would be effective to establish at this juncture a sort of general principles between the two countries and to proceed in accordance with such principles. Such general principles are (1) that the two countries shall live and let live. And that such co-prosperity shall be a hundred year policy of the States and shall not be a temporary one. To cite an example, if Japan does not treat China in such manner as England treats India but enters into a relationship with China which is similar to the relation-

3

5

6

9

8

10

12 13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

23

24

25

ship between Germany and Austria, the co-prosperity of the two countires will be easily realized. He thought that by this Japan will be able to profit more than what England is getting in her relations with India. (2) Next, the cause of estrangement of the relations between our two countires at the present time is the Manchurian question and the positions maintained by the two countries towards this question are fundamentally at variance. In view, however, of the present situation which clearly shows that any improvement of the situation is impossible without touching this causal question, he would like to set up a principle that the two countries shall settle the Manchurian question in the future in a sincere and peaceful manner. That is, in other words, to agree to the effect that Japan in the future will not use force of arms nor will China counteract to it with forces such as volunteers, etc., and that both sides will settle the question in a peaceful way. He then asked my opinion with regard to the establishment of these two general principles.

"3. Whereupon I stated that with regard to
(1) I had already signified my complete agreement to
his opinion which was expressed at the time of my

taking up the present post. Considering from all angles, there can be no objection that the two countries should co-exist and co-prosper. As regards (2) I asked him what does it exactly mean. Then I proceeded by saying that I have repeatedly stated that the existence of Manchukuo is a fait accompli admitting of no change. Therefore, if his proposal touches this fact there can be no room for consideration. I stated the above just to prevent further complication. Wang said that from the Chinese point of view ill feeling of the people will not terminate as long as the Manchurian question remains unsettled. The situation is such that friendship between China and Japan, for instance, is being rendered difficult and in view of the fact that the Chinese people are making the restoration of Manchuria as the prerequisite to such friendship, it is necessary to show to them . some guiding basis in the form of principle (2) as above-mentioned. He further tried to put forward various roundabout discussions.

"4. I told him that I presumed he must be well aware of the cause of the outbreak of the Man-churian Incident. Then I reviewed briefly the state of things which prevailed after the Russo-Japanese War, the independent status of Manchuria in the past

2

3

5

6

7

0

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and wrongs committed by the Chang family, etc., and stated that it is our earnest hope that China, by fixing her eyes upon the wide view of East Asia, will make a clean sweep of the ill feeling in the past, and, making a step further, will adopt the policy of co-prosperity of Japan, Manchukuo and China.

8 9

Wang stated that he understood fully with regard to the circumstances which prevailed in the past. It was his view that although there was a good chance of settling the Manchurian question at the time of the INUKAI Cabinet, the opportunity was lost. He said in the present situation it is impossible for the Chinese people to understand if they are told to shake hands with Japen leaving the situation as it is. The Manchurian question is, so to speak, like a reef in the sea between the two countries. It must be removed. But as it is difficult to remove it now all at once, it was his intention to retain the said reef temporarily as it is and to let the ship go through. That is to say, if the principle as above-mentioned is decided, it will give to the people a basis for entering into friendly relations. Hereupon I repeated Wang's words as above-mentioned in order to call his attention, saying that I understood from what he explained that as the Manchurian question is difficult of settlement it will be reserved as it is, but by the establishment of the principle as above set forth it was his intention to secure a basis to give guidance to the people and thus to open the road for friendship. I told him that as I now understood fully I am going to report the matter in detail to the Japanese Minister for Foreign

2

5

7

0

10

11

12 13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Affairs and to invite his careful consideration. Wang stated he had entertained the above opinion for a long time but refrained from proposing it to this day because he thought it would only give rise to opposition and would mar the chance of its success if he had made public his plan without knowing the prospect of its realization. If the Japanese side will agree to the establishment of the above-mentioned principle, he said he can state that he is confident in carrying it out on his side. He asked me, bearing the above in my mind, to make efforts for the realization of the plan. He also expressed his hope to have early conversation with me after my return from Japan.

"6. In continuation of the above conversation. I told him that, putting aside the points as above mentioned, it was necessary for both countries to remove suspicion and to calm and settle public feeling. in order to meet the situation which stares us in the face. In this connection I pointed out it was a mistake that China hitherto asked help from European and American countries and adopted the so-called policy of checking one foreign country by using another.

-5

.8

I further pointed out instances of favoring Europeans end Americans, such as the purchase of aeroplanes, construction of airfields, employment of advisers, etc., end gave him warning. To which Wang replied that China asked for a little help in the past from European and American quarters, but it was by no means the adoption of the policy of checking one country by using another. He understood that it displeases Japan to consult only with European and American countries without asking Japan's help. At present it is difficult to shake hands positively with Japan, but hereafter he would make efforts to get in touch conservatively with Jepen and to try to avoid stimulating ill feeling on the Japanese side. He again referred to our attitude with regard to the Fukien Incident and expressed his hope that Japan will refrain from becoming involved in such Chinese disturbances in the future as in the case of the said Incident. He stated that this would be very effective in giving guidance to the Chinese people."

There is a certificate, which I shall not read.

We now offer in evidence defense document

2020. This is a telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA

to the various Japanese embassies with respect to the

HIROTA-Lindley conversation on April 25, 1934. That

3

2

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

conversation erose out of the situation created by the unauthorized statement of AMAU given to the press without the section of the Foreign Minister in March 1934.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your honor, the prosecution objects to this document. In our submission, if it is desired to prove this conversation, the correct way is to call evidence to that effect, which is clearly available, and this, in our submission, is merely an indirect way of trying to get this conversation in evidence.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunel please, we respectfully submit that this is competent evidence as it is shown from its face that it is a telegram sent by Foreign Minister HIROTA to the various embassies and reports the actual conversation with Ambassador Lindley.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2020 will receive exhibit 3244.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3244 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read defense exhibit 1 3244: 2 April 26, 1934 "Sent: 3 Embassies in U.S., Great Britain, "To: 4 China, Manchukuo, Peiping; Consulates (-General) at Tsingteo, Banking, Foochow, Amoy, Canton, Tientsin, 6 Tsinan, Hongkong, Hankow. 7 Foreign Minister HIROTA "From: 8 "Subject: HIROTA-Lindley Conversation on 9 April 25 concerning Problem of Informal Statement. 10 "Circular No. 460 (Simplified Code) 11 "1. Ambassador Lindley called on the 25th 12 and read telegraphic instructions from his home Govern-13 ment, the substance of which follows: 14 "(a) It is presumed that the source of the 15 recent statement is authoritative, and its nature is 16 such that Great Britain is unable to ignore it. 17 "(b) The Nine-Power Treaty stipulates the 18 equality of rights of the various signatory Powers. 19 Great Britain must insist on these common rights being 20 respected, elthough it recognizes exceptions where the 21 22 rights of the signatory Powers are restricted by special 23 agreements such as, for instance, a consortium agreement, 24

or as regards those recognized by the signatory Powers

as being special rights of Japan.

3

Insofar as the statement in question is motivated by the concern over China's integrity and peace, it concurs with the sim of Britain's policies. However, if it is assumed that Japan alone is entitled to decide what measures are prejudicial, Great Britain must take exception. Under Articles I and VII of the Nine-Power Treaty, Japan has the right to invite attention to the measures of the other signatory Powers which she considers injurious to her security. In view of the fact that this right guarantees Japan's security, it is presumed that the statement in question does not purport to repudiate the common rights of the Powers with respect to Chins or that Japan herself seeks to violate her treaty obligations.

24

"(d) Replying to questions in Parliament, Foreign
Secretary Simon stated that 'it appears that the statement in question was made due to the apprehension that
certain activities of the Powers in China are injurious to peace in the Orient or to Sino-Japanese relations or to China's security, but there is no
reason for such apprehension to arise as far as
Britain's policies are concerned. Britain is, as
a matter of fact, avoiding injurious measures such
as mentioned.' Since it is expected that similar
questions will be made during the week, the British
Government wishes to make inquiries of the Japanese
Government concerning the statement in question in
the most friendly spirit.

"2. The Ambassador summarized the main points of the above instructions as being: (1) not-withstanding the fact that Japan, under the Nine-Power Treaty (Articles I and VII), possesses the right + invite the attention to measures taken by other signatory Powers which she considers injurious to peace in the Orient and to China's integrity, why should she find it necessary to issue a statement of this nature? (2) if Japan seeks to be the sole judge as to what constitute injurious measures, it would be tantamount to be claiming something over and above

•

the equal rights of the Nine-Power Treaty. He added that the British Government are not by any means blaming Japan for violations of the said treaty.

"3. Accordingly, after stating that I shall reply to his overtures if I find it necessary to do so after due study and explaining to him that the statement in question was not in any way an official statement in the same way as I had done to Grew as per my circular telegram No. 459, I requested clarification on two or three points in his inquiries in the following manner:

"(a) Firstly I stated that: I deeply appreciate Foreign Secretary Simon's statement in Parliament that your government will not take any measures which are injurious to peace in the Orient and to China's integrity; however, Japan has hither-to strictly adhered to the Nine-Power Treaty and has never violated it; she has repeatedly given assurances since the League of Nations conference that she does not intend to violate it, and it is strange that at this time other nations should entertain doubts; in this sense. I find it difficult to understand by your government has referred to the Nine-Power Treaty and what points of that treaty have come into question.

in short, the statement of the 17th has created the impression as if Japan was claiming rights in China over and above the rights which she possesses in common with the Powers under the Nine-Power Treaty and that especially her claim for the judgeship as to whether or not the policies of the Powers are injurious to peace in the Orient and to China's integrity is a problem.

"To my remarks that, after all, the conscience of the conspirators is the most accurate judge and that as to claiming rights under the Nine-Power Treaty over the common rights of the signatory Powers, it cannot be thought of so long as that treaty is not denounced, Ambassador Lindley nodded agreement.

"(b) Next, I stated that: Japan respects
the principles of the Open Door and Equal Opportunity
and has no objections whatever to the bona fide
commercial activities of the Powers with China, but
rather, since the situation is such that she does
not enjoy equal opportunity with the Powers due to the
still continuing boycott by China, Japan has even
more reason than the Powers to insist on the observance of the principles of the Open Door and Equal

Opportunity; with respect to investments in China, while China is neglecting the loan consortium, which still exists, in view of the present political 3 situation in China, investments in China will not 4 only mean money thrown away, as Foreign Secretary 5 Grey once said, but will give rise to harmful results for China (the A-bassador added that Britain 7 will on no account invest in China); furthermore, 8 9 while 't appears that of late persons claiming to represent the League (of Nations) or under the 10 11 pretext of doing business are pouring into China 12 and are busily engaged in activities from various ulterior motives, Japan naturally cannot view such 14 activities with indifference, and moreover in view of the geographical relations between China and 16 Japan, is it not logical for Japan, a neighbor, to 17 feel greater concern if a fire breaks out in China 18 than those farther away? 19

"(c) A bassador Lindley stated that he understood from my explanations the general situation and said he would telegraph accordingly to his Government immediately.

"I told him informally that although I felt that I had in general answered fully the various points of his overtures, I shall reply further if,

25

20

21

22

23

24

after careful consideration, there should be points on which such is considered necessary." 2 I will not read later notations, but I in-3 vite the Tribunal's attention to the note which says 4 the telegram is to be relayed to the various embas-5 sies at London, Washington, and Brazil, and there-6 after to the other branches of the diplomatic service. 7 We next offer in evidence defense document 8 2021. This is a telegram from Foreign Minister 9 HIROTA to various Japanese embassies, dated April 26, 10 1934, with respect to the situation arising out of 11 12 the unauthorized Amau statement of March 1934. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2021 15 will : ceive exhibit No. 3245. 16 (Whereupon, the document above 17 referred to was marked defense exhibit 18 No. 3245 and received in evidence.) 19 MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3245: 20 "SENT: April 26, 1934. 21 "TO: Embassies in Britain, U. S., China, 22 Manchukuo; also to Peiping and Nanking. 23 "FROM: Foreign Minister HIROTA. 24

"SUBJECT: Concerning the question of the

Unofficial Announcement.

25

"Circular No. 465 (Code)

"Reference my Circular No. 435:

"On the 26th, Ambassador Grew called and stated that he had received a telegram from his home gover ment to obtain a translation of the unofficial announcement of the 17th.

mentioned unofficial announcement not only was not official in any sense as I said yesterday but was merely printed in the newspapers from replies made by the official in charge to various questions asked by newspaper reporters and that, therefore, there could be no translation; however, the replies of the official in charge which appeared in the newspapers about the 21st (see my telegram Circular No. 435) generally explained the standpoint of the Japanese Government. And in accordance with the Ambassador's request, I handed him a translation of the gist of the above-mentioned replies as per separate telegram Circular No. 466.

"I handed the (contents of the) separate telegram also to the British Erbassy with the above explanations. In both cases, it was added that there was no objection to quoting the contents of the separate telegram.

"Both this and separate telegram to be 1 relayed: 2 "From the Embassy at London to all ambas-3 sadors in Europe except Turkey and to Geneva. 4 "From the Embassy at Washington to New York." We next offer in evidence defense document 7 8 2022, which is self-explanatory. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 11 2022 will receive exhibit No. 3246. 12 ("hereupon, the document above 13 referred to was marked defense exhibit 14 . 3246 and received in evidence.) 15 MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3246. 16 "SENT: April 26, 1934. 17 "TO: Embassies in Britain, U. S., China, 18 Manchukuo, Peiping, Consulate-General at Nanking. 19 "FROM: Foreign Minister HIROTA. 20 "SUBJECT: Concerning the question of the 21 Unofficial Announcement. 22 "No. 466 Circular (Simplified Code). 23 "Separate Telegram. 24 "Japan has not infringed upon China's in-25 dependence or interests, nor has she the slightest

ŧ

intention to do so. In fact, she sincerely desires the preservation of territorial integrity of China and her unification and prosperity. These ends should, fundamentally speaking, be attained by China herself through her self-awakening and voluntary efforts.

"Japan has no intention to trespass upon
the rights of other powers in China. Their bona
fide financial and commercial activities will reound to the benefit of China which is quite
welcome to Japan. She, of course, subscribes to
the principles of the Open Door and Equal Opportunity in China. She is observing scrupulously
all existing treaties and agreements concerning that
country.

"However, Japan cannot remain indifferent to anyone's taking action under any pretext, which is prejudicial to the maintenance of law and order in East'Asia for which she, if only in view of her geographic position, has the most vital concern. Consequently, she cannot afford to have questions of China exploited by any third party for the execution of a selfish policy which does not take into consideration the above circumstances."

There is a certificate attached which I shall

not read.

We offer in evidence defense document 2018, which is an address of Mr. HIROTA, as Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the 67th session of the Imperial Diet on January 22, 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document on the ground that it is merely repetitive. It contains another discussion of Japan's foreign policy, of her peaceful intentions in her relations with other countries, and states that the future progress of Manchukuo will depend on cooperation with Japan. It also discusses naval disarmament and states that the Washington Treaty has become incompatible and makes references to the question of arms limitation; also references to the relations existing with Russia. The conditions in China are deplored, and there is the statement that Japan is not receiving the treatment to which she is entitled in foreign trade with the world.

It is suggested by the prosecution that all this is repetitive.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in our submission this address of Mr. HIROTA as Foreign Minister is not repetitive.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there anything new in it?

MR. YAMAOKA: In this respect, if I may say so, if your Honors please: The rule as to repetitiveness, as I understand it, applies where there is an accumulation of evidence on the same matter, on one incident, let us say.

THE PRESIDENT: Where the subsequent documents add nothing to the earlier ones and are no stronger; I think that would be the way to put it.

MR. YAMAOKA: I am quite well aware of the fat that the subject matter of this document is very similar to the previous speeches made by Mr. HIROTA as Foreign Minister in the Diet.

THE PRESIDENT: We had his spee hes in the Diet along the same line, didn't; we?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, it is quite true; your Honor. But we do not have his speech of this date. In other words, we are endeavoring to show that during the course of Mr. HIROTA's care or in the Japanese Government, he said such a thing on such a day; that he said another thing on another day; and to show the consistency of his position throughout. And we intend, as your Honors have no doubt--

THE PRESIDENT: I think a majority will admit t is, but they are not anxious that the whole should be read. It may be you can cut it down. It is admitted

on the usual terms. The objection is overruled.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2018 will receive exhibit No. 3247.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3247 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I desire to announce, if the Tribunal please, that I do not intend to read page 1 of this exhibit--

THE PRESIDENT: Page 8 probably contains all that is material.

MR. YAMAOKA: --including the first line of page 2.

THE PRESIDENT: We will leave it to your judgment.

MR. YAMAOKA: Thank you, sir. I shall read from the first paragraph of page 2.

"The Japanese Government are paying particular attention to the naval disarmament question. I had occasion at the last session to speak about the Preliminary Naval Conversation which took place in London between Japan, Great Britain, and the United States of America. The fundamental policy of the Japanese Government in the present negotiations is, as I then explained in full, to carry out a sweeping reduction of

armaments and to effect a total abolition or a drastic limitation of the offensive arms, so as to free each power from the menace of the other powers and, in fact, to make it impossible for any power to menace another. The Washington Treaty of Naval Limitation of 1922, having now become incompatible with our basic policy, our government notified the Government of the United States on December 29 last year of Japan's intention to terminate that treaty in accordance with its provisions. In consequence, the Washington Treaty will cease to be in force as from the last day of December 1936. This step must not be taken to mean that we intend to launch out on any expansion of our armaments, which is far from our thought. On the contrary, we look forward to the conclusion of another pact to supersede the Washington Treaty -- a pact based on a new formula which shall be truly consonant with the spirit of disarmament. The Preliminary Conversations, which afforded the powers an opportunity to discuss thoroughly all relevant matters and to make known their respective views more or less definitely, was adjourned on December 20, as it was then deemed advisable to enable the delegates of the powers to consult their home governments on the results of the conversations so far attained. It was arranged, however, that a close

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

6

3

15

17

19

20

22

24

during the recess, and that the negotiations should be reopened as soon as a proper moment arrives. We sincerely hope for, and are devoting our best efforts to bring about, an early resumption of these negotiations for the achievement of a new equitable agreement which will embody the principles of non-aggression and non-menace and effect an actual and sweeping armament reduction, and advance thereby the cause of world peace.

"Japan and the United States have been bound not only by a vital economic relationship of mutual interdependence unparalleled elsewhere, but also by a historical bond of friendship ever since the commencement of their intercourse. There exists no question between the two countries which is intrinsically difficult of an amicable solution. Certainly, it is unimaginable that there should be any cause of conflict between the two countries separated by the vast expanse of the Pacific. As for our former ally, Great Britain, while it is true that in order to safeguard our oversea trade, we have yet to discuss various matters with that country, I cannot think of any part of the globe, where the adjustment of interests between us right be considered in any way unattainable. It is needless to say that good understanding and cooperation

24

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

between Japan and Great Britain constitute really an important contribution to the peace of the world.

"It is consideration of these relationships that the Japanese Government have carried on negotiations with America and with Great Britain in accordance with the spirit expressed above. And it is in the spirit of this policy that we wish to deal with all other countries, especially with our neighbor states with which we are anxious to foster good will and fraternal sentiments without any mutual menace.

"We have been guided wholly by the same spirit in all our negotiations with the Soviet Union. The pending negotiations on the transfer of the North Manchuria Railway have made further progress since I last spoke and it will not perhaps be long before an agreement is reached. If the transfer serves to eliminate the source of such disputes as have occurred hitherto so frequently along that railway, and to strengthen the friendship between Japan, Manchoukuo and the Soviet Union, the prime objective of the present negotiations will have been attained. Our government are planning to accelerate the peaceful development of Soviet-Japanese relations by redoubling their efforts for the solution of other pending problems. To that end a hearty cooperation on the part

of the Soviet Union is, of course, essential. In this connection, I cannot but hope that the Soviet Government will give special consideration to the erection of military works in the Far East, especially along the Soviet-Manchoukuo frontiers, with a view to promoting mutual trust and assurance.

"Of late, the political situation in China has been somewhat quiet. That, except for the fighting between the communist armies and the government troops, there is no civil war there at present is most gratifying not only for China herself but for the sake of the peace of Last Asia, with which Japan is most vitally concerned. However, it cannot be denied, if only in the light of history alone that in the Chinese political situation many serious possibilities are still latent. While fortunately the main strength of the Red armies in the direction of Kiangsi and Fukien appears to have been driven away from those territories by the expeditionary forces sent by the government, the remaining units of these armies are said to be establishing contact with their allies in Kueichow and Szechwan and thereabouts and moving westward into the remoter regions. In view of this fact, coupled with the reports of the Sovietization of Sinkiang, the Japanese Government will be obliged to continue to watch with concern the

1

2

3

4

activities of the Communist Party and armies in China. Again, it is to be regretted that even now in certain localities of China the anti-Japanese agitation has not yet been completely brought to an end. Japan attaches great importance to her friendship with other states in East Asia and counts on their participation in bearing the serious responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and order in this part of the world. I fervently hope, therefore, and only that China will soon recover her stability, but that she will awake to the realization of the whole situation of East Asia and undertake to meet the genuine aspirations of our country. In view of our position as China's neighbor and a stabilizing force in East Asia it is our policy to try to assist China in the attainment of this goal. I may add that the Japanese Government are glad to acknowledge the fact that, as has been indicated in the gradual solution of various long-pending questions, there is today a growing trend among the Chinese people to appreciate the true motive of Japan. While we will do everything to encourage this tendency, I hope that China will collaborate with us further in that direction.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Now turning to Japan's trade relations, I am sorry to state that the policy of trade restriction

activities of the Communist Party and armies in C Again, it is to be regretted that even now in certain localities of China the anti-Japanese agitation has not yet been completely brought to an end. Japan attaches great importance to her friendship with other states in East Asia and counts on their participation in bearing the serious responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and order in this part of the world. I fervently hope, therefore, and only that China will soon recover her stability, but that she will awake to the realization of the whole situation of East Asia and undertake to meet the genuine aspirations of our country. In view of our position as China's neighbor and a stabilizing force in East Asia it is our policy to try to assist China in the attainment of this goal. I may add that the Japanese Government are glad to acknowledge the fact that, as has been indicated in the gradual solution of various long-pending questions, there is today a growing trend among the Chinese people to appreciate the true motive of Japan. While we will do everything to encourage this tendency, I hope that China will collaborate with us further in that direction.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Now turning to Japan's trade relations, I am sorry to state that the policy of trade restriction

exemplified in the promulgation of high customs tariffs, import restrictions, exchange control and exchange compensation duties, etc., is as prevalent as ever among foreign countries, some of which have even gone so far as to abrogate their commercial treaties with our country. Such a situation is extremely regrettable not only for the sake of Japan but also from the broader viewpoint of the world's economic rehabilitation. Our government are endeavoring to come to a fair agreement with each one of the powers concerned in order to have such measures of trade restriction either modified or removed as far as possible and to promote the mutual interests of both. For a country like Japan with a vast population on the one hand and meagre natural resources on the other, foreign trade constitutes an important peaceful means of livelihood. The advance of Japanese commodities on the markets of the world today is only the fruit of our nation's united and indefatigable labors for many long years. Of course, we are resorting to no unfair devices for the expansion of our trade, while the development of our industries confers substantial benefits on many countries which produce raw material, and at the same time ministers directly to the welfare of multitudes of consumers throughout the world. Moreover, our foreign trade,

-

1

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

-

expanded as it is, actually amounts in volume to the insignificant figure of but three per cent.of the total volume of world trade, and our country occupies only the seventh or eighth place among the principal trading nations of the world, which means that there should be room for even more efforts than hitherto on the part of our people. Fortunately, these facts are being understood more and more by the intelligent public of all countries. While cultivating such understanding to a greater degree and upholding our position on an absolutely fair and just basis, we will strive to obtain the adjustment of mutual interests with every one of the powers concerned.

"Finally, the negotiations with the Netherlands which were begun at Batavia in June last year, have as: vet reached no concrete conclusion owing, as was stated in the last session, to the extreme complexity and the great variety of questions that have to be taken into deliberation. However, the labors of the delegations of both countries during the past six months or more have succeeded not only in clarifying the respective positions of Japan and the Netherlands with reference to trade and removing misunderstandings of various sorts, but also in laying, I believe, an important foundation for the negotiations to follow

hereafter.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"In conclusion, I wish to stress the need of extreme caution as well as strong determination on " the part of our people, if, in the midst of the complicated and unsettled conditions which nowadays universally characterize international relationships, we are to consolidate our position and to realize the consummation of our policy and purpose. Japan's withdrawal from the League of Nations will become effective on the 27th of March next, and ours will be a greater burden of responsibility. But the road for Japan to take has long been chosen. Our foreign policy is such as I have stated. After all, the foreign relations of a country are a reflection of the moral and material strength of its people. If all of us, in conformance to the august will of His Majesty, work together and do what lies in our power, it will not be difficult, I am sure, to surmount any obstacles we may encounter. In the face of the gravity of the present international situation I wish to appeal specially for the united support of the whole nation."

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 30 September 1947, at 0930.)